REMARKS

This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Office Action dated December 15, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the following.

Summary of Rejections

Claims 1-31 were pending at the time of the Office Action.

Claims 22-29 were objected to for informalities.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shaw (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163728).

Claims 7-8 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Chefalas, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,089,589).

Claims 21-26 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Dadhia, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0188419).

Claims 4-6 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163728).

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chefalas, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,089,589) in view of Freund (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,611).

Claims 15-20 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163728) in view of Freund (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,611).

23

Claims 27-28 and 30-31 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dadhia, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0188419).

Summary of Response

Claims 19-20 remain as originally submitted.

Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 18, 21-25, and 30 have been amended.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 12, 15-17, 26-29, and 31 have been canceled.

Claims 32-45 are new.

Remarks and Arguments are provided below.

Summary of Claims Pending

Claims 1, 5, 7-8, 10-11, 13-14, 18-25, 30, and 32-45 are currently pending following this response.

Response to Informalities Objections

Claims 22-29 were objected for the following informalities: "the apparatus of" should be replaced with --the computer network of-- or appropriate correction is required. In response, claims 22-29 have been amended as suggested in the Office Action or canceled.

24

Amendments to the Specification

Various amendments to the specification are made as noted above. All of the amendments to the specification are made to correct for typographical errors. No new matter has been added to the specification with the amendments.

Applicant Initiated Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Colin for granting the interview on February 6, 2007. As noted in the interview summary mailed on February 9, 2007, distinctions between the present disclosure and the cited prior art were discussed with regard to the location of the firewall and the source of the remediation information. The claims have been amended herein in accordance with the discussion to clarify that the firewall is on a computer system connecting to a computer network and the remediation information is provided by a remediation server on the computer network.

The Office Action relied on rejections based on Shaw to disclose a computer system self-initiating a quarantine of itself by raising a firewall. While Shaw does disclose quarantining a computer prior to allowing it to connect to a remediated network, Shaw does not disclose that the quarantine is self-initiated by the computer as required by the claims. In particular, the Office Action relied on disclosure of Shaw related to Fig. 7 and the disclosure of a firewall 712 in the client 708. Looking to the disclosure of Shaw related to Fig. 7, it can be seen that the security measures implemented by the scanning component 702 include verifying that a virus scanner is configured to check for the "I love you" virus, verifying that the firewall 712 is configured

25

to communicate on port 80 only, etc. There is no teaching or suggestion in Shaw that the firewall 712 is used as the inner firewall and outer firewall 100, 406, 408, 800. The Office Action reasoned that because the client 708 has a firewall 712, it would be obvious for the firewall 712 to redundantly perform the functions of the inner and outer firewalls 100, 406, 408, 800 of Shaw. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation for this modification.

The Office Action also relied on the prior art teaching of Chefalas. Chefalas discloses that upon detecting a virus or a worm, the offending computer is removed from a network (column 4, lines 14-19, lines 27-31, and lines 36-42; column 8, lines 2-5 and lines 50-64). There is no teaching or suggestion of temporarily limiting exchanges upon a subsequent re-connection of the computer to the network. Further, Chefalas discloses that once the computer is disconnected from the network, it disinfects itself (column 8, lines 50-64). That is, the computer checks itself for pending remediations. There is no teaching or suggestion of a remediation server in the network remediating the computer, as required by the claims.

The Office Action also relied on the prior art teaching of Dadhia. Dadhia discloses in paragraph 0014 to establish limitations whenever an instance of an application first starts executing. In paragraph 0012, Dadhia discloses one limitation may be to drop a communication being sent to an executing instance of an application if the communication is determined to be infected with a worm. This limitation is maintained until the patch has been installed. The disclosure in Dadhia of dropping an incoming communication does not meet the claim requirements of disconnecting from said computer network. In particular, dropping an incoming communication is not

26

disclosure of a computer system 102 disconnecting from network 104 or the internet 105.

Further, the claims require that the firewall is raised whenever a computer disconnects and reconnects to the computer network. Dadhia discloses to place limitations on instances of an application only if there is a problem. As disclosed in paragraph 0014, "If an instance of an application is up-to-date, then the only overhead may be when the instance is started to see if any limitations need to be placed. Since none need to be placed, there may be no or very little overhead when resources are accessed by the instance." Dadhia does not provide any teaching of disconnecting a computer system 102 from either the network 104 or the internet 105 and subsequently reconnecting the computer system.

Also, Dadhia does not provide any disclosure of what happens when the user computers 102 are powered-up or what happens when the user computers initially register with network 104 or the internet 105. In particular, paragraph 0018 discloses the operation of the dynamic protection system 101 when the computers 102 are already connected to the network 104 and already have access to the internet 105.

No new matter has been added with the claim amendments presented herein. Support for the amendments may be found in at least paragraphs 0064-0077.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. If the Examiner has any questions or comments or otherwise feels it would be helpful in expediting the application, he is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (972) 731-2288.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any further fees associated with any of the foregoing papers submitted herewith, or to credit any overpayment thereof, to Deposit Account No. 50-1515, Conley Rose..

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/22/2007

Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330   ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 731-2288
(972) 731-2289 (facsimile)